



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/737,348	12/15/2000	Raymond Anthony Joao	RJ171	8508

7590 04/18/2007  
RAYMOND A. JOAO, ESQ.  
122 BELLEVUE PLACE  
YONKERS, NY 10703

EXAMINER
----------

GILLIGAN, CHRISTOPHER L

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

3626

SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD OF RESPONSE	MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
3 MONTHS	04/18/2007	PAPER

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire 6 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b> 09/737,348	<b>Applicant(s)</b> JOAO, RAYMOND ANTHONY	
	<b>Examiner</b> Luke Gilligan	<b>Art Unit</b> 3626	

**-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --**

**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 23 January 2007.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**.                      2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 22-25 and 41-45 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 22-25 and 41-45 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All    b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)                                | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)                       | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application                       |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____  |

***Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114***

1. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 1/23/07 has been entered.

***Response to Amendment***

2. In the amendment filed 1/23/07, the following has occurred: claims 21 has been amended. Now , claims 22-25 and 41-45 are presented for examination.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 21-22, 24, 26-27, and 29-35 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Boyer et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,208,973 in view of Provost et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,341,265.

5. As per claim 21, Boyer teaches an apparatus, comprising: a receiver, wherein the receiver receives information regarding an individual, wherein the information regarding an individual is transmitted from a computer or a communication device associated with a healthcare provider and is automatically received by the receiver, wherein the information regarding an individual contains information regarding at least one of a diagnosis and a

Art Unit: 3626

treatment plan (see column 13, lines 18-24); a processing device, wherein the processing device processes the information regarding an individual and at least one of stores the information regarding an individual in a database or a memory device and updates a healthcare record associated with the individual (see column 8, lines 56-67), and further wherein the processing device automatically generates an insurance claim (see column 13, lines 25-30); and a transmitter for automatically transmitting the insurance claim to a computer or a communication device associated with a healthcare insurer or a healthcare payer (see column 14, lines 4-10), wherein the processing device stores information regarding the submission of the insurance claim in the healthcare record associated with the individual (see column 9, lines 1-14).

6. Boyer does not explicitly teach that the processing device automatically generates information regarding an insurance claim, wherein the information regarding an insurance claim is suitable for being automatically submitted to a healthcare insurer or a healthcare payer. Provost teaches a processing device automatically generates information regarding an insurance claim, wherein the information regarding an insurance claim is suitable for being automatically submitted to a healthcare insurer or a healthcare payer (see column 9, lines 24-30) and a transmitter that automatically transmits the information regarding an insurance claim to a healthcare insurer (see column 9, line 66 – column 10, line 6, note that the automatically generated information regarding an insurance claim (i.e. the header information) is included in this transmission). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to incorporate such a feature into the insurance claim generation and submission processing described in Boyer. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to incorporate this feature for the purpose of enhancing the efficiency of the claims creation and submission process in Boyer (see column 9, lines 27-30 of Provost).

Art Unit: 3626

7. As per claim 22, Boyer in view of Provost teaches the apparatus of claim 21 as described above. Boyer further teaches the processing device processes information regarding a symptom or an examination finding regarding the individual, and further wherein the processing device generates a diagnostic report containing information regarding a diagnosis or a list of possible diagnoses (see column 13, lines 42-49).

8. As per claim 24, Boyer in view of Provost teaches the apparatus of claim 22 as described above. Boyer further teaches the processing device generates a treatment report containing information regarding a treatment for the diagnosis or each diagnosis in the list of possible diagnoses (see column 13, lines 42-49).

9. As per claim 26, Boyer in view of Provost teaches the apparatus of claim 21 as described above. Boyer further teaches the processing device processes information regarding at least one of a treatment associated with the diagnosis and a procedure associated with the diagnosis (see column 8, lines 56-67).

10. As per claim 27, Boyer in view of Provost teaches the apparatus of claim 22 as described above. Boyer further teaches the diagnostic report contains information regarding at least one of a misdiagnosis, a treatment success, and a treatment failure (see column 8, lines 56-67, the Examiner considers information regarding past patient treatments, as disclosed by Boyer, to encompass at least information regarding a treatment success).

11. As per claim 29, Boyer in view of Provost teaches the apparatus of claim 21 as described above. Boyer further teaches the processing device processes information regarding at least one of a treatment to be administered to the individual and a procedure to be performed on the individual, and further wherein the processing device determines whether the at least one of a treatment to be administered to the individual and a procedure to be performed on the individual is correct or incorrect (see column 13, lines 42-49, the Examiner considers the degree

Art Unit: 3626

to which a treatment is covered under a patient's profile to be an indication of whether the treatment is correct or incorrect), wherein the processing device generates a treatment response message containing information regarding whether the at least one of a treatment to be administered to the individual and a procedure to be performed on the individual is correct or incorrect, wherein the apparatus transmits the treatment response message to at least one of a computer and a communication device associated with a healthcare provider or healthcare facility (see column 13, lines 42-49).

12. As per claim 30, Boyer in view of Provost teaches the apparatus of claim 29 as described above. Boyer further teaches the treatment response message contains information regarding at least one of a treatment, a procedure, treatment instructions, procedure instructions, treatment steps, and procedure steps (see column 13, lines 42-49).

13. As per claim 31, Boyer in view of Provost teaches the apparatus of claim 21 as described above. Boyer further teaches the insurance claim contains information obtained with at least one of the listed devices (see Figure 6, it is noted that various items, such as "COLLECT VENOUS BLOOD," RHYTH ECG, TRACE," etc. require such devices).

14. As per claim 32, Boyer in view of Provost teaches the apparatus of claim 21 as described above. Boyer further teaches the information regarding the individual is transmitted to the processing device on or over at least one of the Internet and the World Wide Web (see column 12, lines 49-56).

15. As per claim 33, Boyer in view of Provost teaches the apparatus of claim 21 as described above. Boyer further teaches a database, wherein the database contains healthcare records or medical histories associated with a plurality of individuals (see column 8, lines 56-67).

Art Unit: 3626

16. As per claim 34, Boyer in view of Provost teaches the apparatus of claim 21 as described above, wherein the processing device processes information for scheduling an appointment with a healthcare provider (see column 12, lines 6-19).

17. As per claim 35, Boyer in view of Provost teaches the apparatus of claim 21 as described above. Boyer further teaches the apparatus detects an occurrence of an event for which a healthcare provider is to be notified, wherein the processing device generates a notification message, and further wherein the apparatus transmits the notification message to a computer or a communication device associated with the healthcare provider in real-time (see column 13, lines 18-28, the healthcare provider is notified of the patient's coverage profile).

18. Claims 23 and 25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Boyer et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,208,973 in view of Provost et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,341,265 and further in view of Rosenfeld et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,804,656.

19. As per claim 23, Boyer in view of Provost teaches the apparatus of claim 22 as described above. Boyer does not explicitly teach the diagnostic report contains information regarding at least one of a probability of occurrence and statistical information regarding the diagnosis or each diagnosis in the list of possible diagnoses. However, Rosenfeld teaches an apparatus that derives a probability of occurrence with respect to possible diagnoses (see column 43, lines 11-27). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to incorporate such a feature into the apparatus of Boyer. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to incorporate such a feature for the purpose of providing a high level of standardized care (see column 4, lines 28-29 or Rosenfeld).

20. As per claim 25, Boyer in view of Provost teaches the apparatus of claim 24 as described above. Boyer does not explicitly teach generating a treatment report in conjunction



Art Unit: 3626

with information regarding a drug interaction and a treatment interaction. However, Rosenfeld teaches generating a treatment report in conjunction with information regarding a drug interaction and a treatment interaction (see column 23, line 57 – column 24, line 11). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to incorporate such a feature into the apparatus of Boyer. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to incorporate such a feature for the purpose of reducing the occurrence of adverse events (see column 4, lines 26-27 of Rosenfeld).

21. Claim 28 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Boyer et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,208,973 in view of Provost et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,341,265 and further in view of Sun et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,273,856.

22. As per claim 28, Boyer in view of Provost teaches the apparatus of claim 24 as described above. Boyer does not explicitly teach the treatment report contains information regarding at least one of an herbal remedy or treatment, a self-healing remedy or treatment, and an exercise remedy or treatment. However, Sun teaches a treatment report containing at least an exercise remedy or treatment (see column 6, lines 23-33). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to incorporate such a feature into the apparatus of Boyer. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to incorporate such a feature for the purpose of providing enhanced care to patients with pacemakers (see column 1, lines 48-53 of Sun).

23. Claims 41-45 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Boyer et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,208,973 in view of Provost et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,341,265 and further in view of DiRienzo et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,076,066.



Art Unit: 3626

24. As per claims 41-45, Boyer in view of Provost teaches the apparatus of claim 21. Boyer does not explicitly teach that information regarding an individual contains a digital x-ray file, a digital MRI file, a digital CAT scan file, video information or image, and audio information and an image. However, DiRienzo teaches a system for automated insurance claims processing that includes the feature of attaching information regarding an individual to insurance claims that includes a digital x-ray file, a digital MRI file, a digital CAT scan file, video information or image, and audio information and an image (see column 11, lines 13-30). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to incorporate such a feature into the apparatus of Boyer. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to incorporate such a feature for the purpose of further reducing the need for hard copy attachments in conjunction with the electronic filing of insurance claims (see column 7, line 59 – column 8, line 3 of DiRienzo).

#### ***Response to Arguments***

25. In the remarks filed 1/23/07, Applicant argues in substance that the combined teachings of Boyer and Provost fail to teach the limitations of the claims as amended. In response to Applicant's arguments, the Examiner respectfully disagrees and notes that both Boyer and Provost are automated insurance claims submission systems. Therefore, both Boyer and Provost automatically transmit insurance claims upon submission within the system. Furthermore, the information regarding an insurance claim that is automatically generated in Provost (see column 9, lines 24-35) is also automatically transmitted once the claim is completed (see column 9, line 66 – column 10, line 2). Finally, it is respectfully submitted that Boyer teaches storing information regarding the submission of the insurance claim (see column 9, lines 1-14).

Art Unit: 3626

**Conclusion**

26. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.


- Moore teaches a system for the automated submission of insurance claims information.

27. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Luke Gilligan whose telephone number is (571) 272-6770. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday 8am-5:30pm.

28. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Joseph Thomas can be reached on (571) 272-6776. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

29. Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

4/13/07

  
**C. LUKE GILLIGAN**  
**PRIMARY EXAMINER**  
**TECHNOLOGY CENTER 3600**